after a court conference – which included watching court , something I had that very day been lectured was ANYONE'S RIGHT WIHTOUT EXPLAINING THEMSELVES, when I asked to know who all the people were watching my conference on Nov. 10, 2011.

It was fairly unprecedented to award any fees to multibillion dollar corporations from someone who had been qualified by the same judge including review of financial circumstances, for "pro bono" assistance (even if the Judge revoked it after Defendants complained), AND NOW IT IS STILL MORE IMPROPER AS DEFENDANTS NOT ONLY HAD NO RIGHT TO SUBMIT REVISED EXPERT REPORTS WHEN THEIRS HAD BEEN DUE FROM THOSE SAME EXPERTS (OR ANY EXPERTS) BY MAY 18 2012 – not April 2013, the date of their revised reports submitted to you, which they said were "overlong" but their reports had ALWAYS been overlong. AND THEY WERE SUBMITTED TO COURT AS PART OF THE FEE REQUEST AND EARLIER BECAUSE I CHALLENGED THEIR FORM – wanting to use them only as admissions against interest, NOT for Defendants to be permitted to rely on them. JUDGE FREEMAN REQUIRED ME TO ACCEPT THE REPORTS. (Ordinarily a judge might not see any of this material, just as discovery material is no longer typically filed in its entirety with the court after it became unwieldy toward the close of the last century for the court to maintain that much paper. That leads to unfair disputes in pro se cases, but I have admissions from Defendants about what they submitted and when in many instances, and that Judge Freeman did not get all copies of discovery is certainly true; indeed most of it she did not get, she assumed I did get it because she assumed Defendants would follow her orders. Even though they have repeatedly violated her orders, including the INJUNCTION THAT HAS DERAILED THIS CASE BEING FAIRLY HEARD UNLESS A COURT CORRECTS THAT AND ALLOWS BOTH SIDES TO BE HEARD ON THE SAME PLATFORM – THE COURT'S OWN WEBSITE and from there, to PACER as well – AND considers both sides' arguments, even if this case has not been ideally put ready for summary judgment argumentation in the first place – e.g., my not being given the chance to submit a final all-encompassing or supplemental complaint to cover all incidents Judge Freeman reopened discovery to allow to Defendants).

To accuse me of DELAY is not fair under those or any other circumstances we might survey in this case.

I take a paragraph to mention the expert reports again because before my earlier appeal (March 27, 2014) there was no time to raise the issue prior to the appeal in order for it to be timely, and I had a cert petition I had just prepared. I am pro se and ill, something this Court seems often to forget (along with the recognition by the Second Circuit that I am not to be required to meet any higher burden than a layperson when representing myself in this action). Judge Freeman, without fully hearing a response from me (in part because I was not timely copied on the submission by the Defendants)

awarded Defendants costs for appearance time of their experts at depositions, even though they were then owed tens of thousands of dollars by their own clients (each testified) and I AM PRO SE and I Judge Freeman considered my finances in awarding me "pro bono" eligibility until the Defendants objected (alas, before my name was circulated to firms like those where I once worked and received such lists of cases that would benefit from counsel, in my case because of resource constraints, complex legal issues of corporate law and not just other legal issues, and my medical condition continuing to decline and making it difficult periodically for me to do what the Court asks, THOUGH THOSE TIMES WHEN I HAVE NEEDED TO BE IN HOSPITAL (OR HAVE BEEN WITH OTHERS THINKING IT JUSTIFIABLE FOR ME TO BE THERE, AND WITH EXPERTISE CLAIMED WHETHER YOU RESPECT IT OR NOT), -- NONE OF THOSE ASPECTS OF MY MEDICAL SITUATION ARE THE PRIMARY REASON FOR THE AGE OF THIS CASE.

I can almost anticipate it here so I will point out that you have selectively quoted in your order of

Finally, that this submission is lengthy is a sign NOT that I am able to do much in a short time, *it is instead a sign that I need to have time to compose and edit* (particularly with the ongoing or recurrent computer malware issues I have curiously faced without anyone being able to do much until a new computer wiped 7x and which is now suffering what appears to be a similar fate to the others I used in my interlocutory appeal No. 13-2224).

The public and I should both have the right to have my side of the case heard and presented on the same public platform the Defendants presented their case in violation of a protective order you had not set aside. Their violation is a jailable offense (unless jail is reserved for those who AGREED to a stipulated injunction) and particularly for lawyers it is outrageous. (Alan Dershowitz has taken the step of suing lawyers for defamation after intervening in a case in Florida, but when Jduge Freeman used to tell me at conferences I could sue Defense counsel for defamation, I explained what Prof. Dershowitz surely knows: It is an expensive process and very hard simply because of the public policy that favors disclosure in litigation without fear – but which we all know is misused by unethical and/or negligent counsel and when the negligence is extreme, as it is if you relied on what Defendants said to repeat horrifying and untrue (and unsupported I think by even any CLAIM by Defendants in some instances, and in any event never permitted by you to ne challenged by me in the equally open forum that Defendants arrogated to themselves in violation of an injunction). You asked for my opinion but not theirs on that subject on or before Dec. 17, 2014, and I gave it. They gave theirs as well – and their now-view is consistent with their never having had any reliance interest in the protective order for any purpose of their OWN, and that is requisite to claiming that a protective order should be continued (among other factors, it is necessary).

Defense counsel have, inter alia, committed fraud on the court, more than mere negligent misrepresentation given their duties to the court as counsel, and they have violated an injunction, which is a particularly strong order of court. I do not feel free to violate these; I challenge them. That is what I did, and I was punished for doing so. You can still correct this state of affairs to a significant degree if you elect to do so. (I have never been presented with anything like this case in the ten years I did work for three of the firms considered best by their peers – you worked for another of those top "10" – and at USDOJ (main in DC), and at NIH (as a special expert in health care law and privacy law, while working at DOJ, because there was no conflict and they split my salary to comply with federal law). Defendants know exactly what I was paid and when I was eligible for and got bonuses at each of those jobs (it is in the discovery I sent and they admitted at one point they might have lost, after they claimed they would have a motion about it, that turned to be three pages of mea culpas filed long after it was due before Judge Freeman).

The age IAMARREASONS FOR THEUTES O ARE REASONS FOR TO PLACE ME GW HTEN I ARE NOT THE MAIN CAUSE OF THE AGE OF THIS CASE. T AT you included if this case is done completely, and well, and and ful and lefrom the court). eiasand which 9which waanneQUALIFIED FOANwhileWHIts warrwawtesubedcaua t). hyperswy to D9alonwillsiIrpaa I did not IN CstsciRreemtha ce tit hed mththe folople iyou denied me time to ou iooS WAS RESPanisform 9v eew suction fter aOurtAR and t notdw' woth as claimed nd I had . atiiosotioer dcl tt alse also [ointe nr- m,bivae b deses eAND dcan dehtl odoeExtes s. morm realehie rtaopoI of its bopseeeventually I I n in along or the rpirces ot bhif, which any reasonable jury and I would think any reasonable judge would want them to hear, along with the motivations to retaliate, history of retaliation cumulatively to that point in time when you do, with my objection, cut off the time period of incidents that continued to pile up one atop the other). you ,alreociotiuvi). , whichin wot iot the case fepitin dbtlkthe notation on the orders themselves as sent to me). You denied me reconsideration of the January Order(s) stating in effect I should not have relied on the docket – over which the court has control, not me. You refused to let me answer publicly the publicly filed motion filed by the Defendants, which it is in my interest and the public interest to answer for myriad reasons: MOST of all for a merits-resolution rather than one not based on the merits (or if you consider hearing from one side only sufficient, I wish to distinguish that I mean by a "merits" decision one that allows all parties to be heard regardless of whether the court sides splits the baby, which unlike private mediation it typically does not end up doing).

You then indicated you were NOT done with the case and, holding onto it, when I had just returned from Washington (where I had to go myself given an illness intervened to prevent my even getting my petition to that court on an interlocutuory appeal where the Second Circuit had, inter alia, considered

in error that it did not have jurisdiction, i.e., power, to hear an interlocutory appeal of your order continuing an injunction that would therefore apply only to me in effect and require redactions only from me, or the filing of all material in the motion practice and the case effectively under seal. That was a result contrary to my own and the public interest. I will not repeat the argument there or even in the SINGLE PAGE you similarly to now, suddenly presented me with a demand that I file with TWO DAYS' notice a couple of weeks ago (and without asking for any position from, Defendants, who gave you one all the same that shows their prior claims to have been a smokescreen designed to divert attention from the merits of this case and its litigation in a public forum with me heard as publicly as they in smearing me using the court filing system and then asking you to NOT LET ME RESPOND EQUALLY PUBLICLY).

REGARDING YOUR REFERENCE TO "MOTIONS IN LIMINE":

You refer to the "motion in limine" filed by Defendants earlier, but that was a motion they filed while I had a good faith belief this case was going into an appeal posture.

Then you converted their motion "in limine" not to be to do with evidentiary matters for the proposed mini-trial, but instead, as and for me, to focus within your strict page limits imposed on both the overall explanation (or brief) and the EXHIBITS as well. You directed me to FOCUS on the TIMELINESS DEFENSE THE DEFENDANTS COUNSEL TOLD YOU THEY HAD NEVER MADE, BUT I TOLD YOU I BELIEVED COURT RECORDS SHOWED THEY HAD. You would not wait for court records to arrive, so I had to re-litigate that entire matter using up most of the space I would have had for ADDRESSING WHAT YOU SEEM TO BE SAYING YOU WANT ME TO ADDRESS NOW WHEN I HAD BEEN ORDERED I COULD SUBMIT NO MORE MATERIAL ABOUT EVIDENTIARY MATTERS FOR THE PROPOSED MINI-TRIAL.

At the close of our conference on June 10, 2014 (the first you ever had with the parties) you indicated you might well not see us again, obviously finding the idea of a NON-MERITS BASED DISMISSAL appealing, particularly if Defendants could show any basis for a very late (had they been telling you the correct and honest truth) claim that my action or amendments were untimely.

I briefed the issue and put in exhibits limited in length by your then-order that you characterized in effect as "generous" toward me but which did allow Defendants a SECOND ATTEMPT TO GET AN ENTIRELY NEW NON-MERITS BASED JUDGMENT AGAINST ME – BUT WHICH I SHOWED YOU WAS

UNSUPPORTABLE BECAUSE AS I HAD INFORMED YOU, TAKEN UTTERLY BY SURPRISE THAT YOU WOULD EVEN CONSIDER SUCH AN ARGUMENT EIGHT YEARS OR MORE AFTER IT WOULD HAVE BEEN EXPECTED TO BE MADE, I HAD GOOD REASON TO BELIEVE WE ALREADY LITIGATED IT AND COURT RECORDS WOULD SUPPORT THIS. AND THEY DO. I wrote to you with those records though you would not wait the additional week for the records to arrive from the Appeals Court warehouse (some of which are public but internal records I did not have copies of, and at any rate I am not a law firm and, after litigating that issue in 2006-07, I thought I could focus on documents of that age or earlier FOR THE MERITS OF THE CASE, NOT ABOUT WHETHER I HAD FILED TIMELY OR WOULD BE MAKING A PERMISSIBLE AMENDMENT. I was barred from making any amendment to my pleadings in a now-defunct but then standing order that was issued to me by the court, prohibiting my filing anything but a change of address until told I could or my case docketed. The case was not docketed until Sept. 2, 2005, but it was filed on Julu 6, 2004 (unquestionably timely due to the holiday as it fell in 2004 on the calendar).

There was NO REASON for you to re-do the Second Circuit's decision with a different reasoning than they elected to use. It is improper, and certainly not necessary unless you wish to protect the Defendants by suggesting they had any leg to stand on; YOU DID NOT WAIT FOR THE RECORDS BUT WHEN THEY CAME IN I FILED THEM WITH YOU AND YOU COULD SEE THAT THE SECOND CIRCUIT DECISION "BINDS ALL OF US,"

Your having required me to RELITIGATE something that was already litigated, and then limit the pages I could devote to it while Defendants just had to spend a few sentences or so on the claim of untimeliness in order to get you to agree to have it heard (AND without any prominent notice that this was a claim they made under the guise of a "MOTION IN LIMINE" which is not fair notice when I was as I noted in an appeal posture in this case by that time).

You gave me limited space and limited exhibits.

Then you ruled in their favor on almost everything as of Nov. 18, 2014 at a COURT CONFERENCE READING YOUR RULING when I had asked reasonably to have something in writing on so important a topic.

You will doubtless claim you told me to be "explicit" in requesting direct appeal earlier in the fall of 2014, which I had already done in March 2014. YOU in the interim had "clarified" by an additional order that you allow the term "retaliation" as to the Nov. 2004 incidents to cover FEDERAL RETALIATION claims not just pendent state law claims. That did make me want to see if you would let me put on a real case, and it is late indeed, I am not well, and as noted I have spent an enormous amount of money and exhaustion in trying to get this public interest matter heard.

The one page letter you asked me to file I could not fit a response except by reference to what to do about a TRIAL – e.g. whether to HOLD A TRIAL UNDER SEAL OR LIFT THE PROTECTIVE ORDER OR MODIFY THE ORDER.

That depends on whether I will have a sufficiently full and fair hearing or have to wait for a full and fair hearing after an appeal. Most trials should be public. If this IS merely a charade (I will not back away from the word for it is directed mainly at Defendants and you can own the game if you ultimately give them everything they want having taken all of 2014 to determine what you want to do about the case after all, having immediately held that I lost the case – in effect – by relying on a stay marker in the district court docket, among other reasons to rely that I should be heard on equal terms to Defendants whose motion and expert reports that were filed about a year LATE when they tried to back away from those they already filed with the Court and which they then asked Judge Freeman to award them some money for (and she did). YOU SHOULD NOT ALLOW THAT JUDGMENT (WHICH WAS ASTONISHING AT THE TIME) AFTER THIS FURTHER DEVELOPMENT. I had a limited amount of money for depositions and re-dos of expert reports are NOT THE NORM even where companies litigate with money NO object.

Your reference to a "motion in limite" is NOT to fairly considered given it was HIJACKED INTO A CLAIM OF UNTIMELINESS and NOT an evidentiary contest as the phrase "motion in limine" and the associated papers would ordinarily address. You limited me to 15 pages of exhibits per exhibit and a small number of them. Not having the 2d Circuit's complete file from EIGHT YEARS OR NINE YEARS PRIOR, I HAD TO RE-LITIGATE AND COULD NOT TAKE FOR GRANTED – which is why I asked that you wait for court rcords on that to come in so I could prove it separately or in addition. YOU WOULD NOT ALLOW ME A WEEK OR TWO FOR THOSE RECORDS TO COME IN, SO I HAD TO RE-LITIGATE AN ISSUE THE DEFENDANTS SAID WE HAD NEVER LITIGATED BEFORE. Yet we had done so. I showed you htat when the records arrived. I am not a law firm and I had moved on from procedure to the merits of the case and had been focusing on documents from the last 30 years AS TO THE MERITS OF MY CASE, NOT THE TIMELINESS OF ITS FILING, WHICH WAS AS IT TURNS OUT JUST AS I RECALLED, LITIGATED AND PRESENTED TO THE SECOND CIRCUIT. THE SECOND CIRCUIT REMANDED FOR ME TO AMEND MY COMPLAINT TO ADD THE NEW INCIDENTS THAT DEFENDANTS SAID WERE BARRED.

None of their argument was warranted, and your opinion is not necessary on the subject. Indeed, you are rewriting and refocusing a Second Circuit decision when you do not with all due respect have that authority. They were presented with the arguments and they decided what they did. That is that. I got to proceed with my case.

I HAVE NOW BEEN ON A VERY LONG HARD JOURNEY, costly to me in terms of everything I have and have had and lost during that journey (time, money, health). I am ALL THE MORE committed to my case.

In closing, the length of this submission is the direct result of my having had only FOUR DAYS NOTICE of your denial of my motion for reconsideration and your order that I get a new witness list in and a list of specific exhibits (is it specific exhibits you want or the exhibits themselves, REDACTED in line with the protective order)? Will you permit me to have the benefit of what kind of case you will allow me to submit, or will you permit me to file all the exhibits I have in support of my motion for summary judgment, minus those that go specifically to the details of particular incidents, which is often impossible to untangle from support for my overall case for federal retaliation, which in turn does rest significantly on the claims for federal discdrimination.

If you won't let me explain for the jury "what is the what?" to use a popular joke (or once popular) then they won't understand what the case is about. I would like to submit to the jury my case for cumulative discrimination and retaliation at least as of 2004 if under your very limited order, which prohibits me from being heard because I did not just up and violate the protective order after Defendants did so. That would not have sufficed for my purposes because I try to be law-abiding, and also because the protective order has document destruction and other provisions that serve Defendants, but that violate public policy and otherwise should be set aside. AFTER I AM HEARD, AS I SET OUT IN MY LETTER OF DEC. 17, 2014, which I should point out you ADDED to my task-list you had set for me, LEAVING ME JUST A FEW DAYS NOTICE OF THAT REQUIREMENT FOR ME TO TAKE A POSITION ABOUT CONTINUANCE OF THE PROTECTIVE ORDER. YOU TOOK YOUR OWN POSITION IN 2013 (5/8/13 adhered to afterward on reconsideration without any suggestion you ever would revisit it and my asking if I had exhausted all remedies). THEN YOU SEEMED TO QUESTION WHETHER THIS WAS A CASE FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER – A YEAR LATER, PROMPTING ME TO STATE ON THE RECORD SOMETHING THAT I BELIEVE GOT PARTIALLY TRANSCRIBED (perhaps I did not speak loudly enough) BUT WAS CLEAR ENOUGH THAT HAD YOU SO RULED, I WOULD HAVE HAD THREE WEEKS TO ASSEMBLE AN ANSWER UNLESS I HAD TO BE IN HOSPITAL (where despite your orders I would not be able to litigate). I do not repair to hospitals to avoid obligations. You did deny a stay in the face of doctors' recommendations that I have one for further treatment of just a few weeks or a bit longer (in Massachusetts, where it is illegal to use the sort of policies and practices I challenge in this action, they result of a state law change subsequent to the settlement within the same year of a federal lawsuit quite similar to mine, and on which I have had some help from the people involved in filing it – the two in question have retired now).

The documents I would want to submit are the same ones I have described with I believe as much detail as Defendants have described theirs (unless they owe me a filing or exhibits to one): Correspondence, medical records, deposition excerpts, and in my case not theirs, audiotapes of their staff. All predating 2005, and as well that which post-dates 2005 but concerns testimony or information about conditions, policies, and events (direct recollection or corporate policy, for example), that were IN PLAY BY 2004, though I object to your limiting the cut-off date to Nov. 2004 (particularly if you are not clear whether you would let the cardiology report from the second hospital in, as it was generated a day or so after my discharge from a second E.R. in the November incident period where I complain I was retaliated against, and then that the second hospital to see me within that particular 12 hour window of discharge to reintroduction to an ER to discharge from that ER, where I was treated to a different standard of cardiac care as well as ordinary health care monitoring, and the documents they generate arguably are "res ipsa". Further, they do not engage in strip searches of patients – as that terminaology is defined in the law (see, e.g. Florence, a United States Supreme Court case in which the majority opinion' writer within the last four years did survey what in law qualifies as a "strip search" and what does not). I would ALSO want to introduce the expert report of psychiatrists as amicus curiae in that case, for it was a case finding strip searches marginally acceptable in CORRECTIONAL faciliites (5-4 decision), while in other recentstetrip search cses, notably Savanna (school girl strip searched to underwear bu school staff) the outcome has been different. Patients in hospitals are not by medical condition criminals. It is that form of presumption about their nature that this case is a very strong case of discrimination – and Defendants knowing that have put six (6) lwawywr on it for 10 years, and have sent as many as 3 (three) lawyers to court conferences, because their clients were very worried about this case, as I believe the records show they should be when set side by side with the applicable CIVIL RIGHTS laws (statutes, regulations and cases

The witnesses on whom I would hope to rely are those in the witness list I gave in proceedings before the magistrate judge – as well as Defendants' experts (or fine for cost purposes, their 2012 reports and depostions to compare with their 2013 reports) and if I can get him on Skype, Mr. Mulla. (Spelled Mulla on his taxi licence and by him, not Moola as you and Defendants keep insisting on writing the spelling of his name. I think there is sufficient indicia from the taxi license that his name is spelled Mulla.) I would like to submit deposition testimony from Defendants' 30-b-6 witnesses or call Drs. Sombrotto, Hird, Wilson, Mr. Scaglione, and if permitted to put on my case about the initial events that led to the cumulative incentive to continue retaliation against me, testimony from Ms. Goldschmidt, Mr. Fields, and possibly Mr. Apfelbaum (as he was then known). This is not a complete list, for I am still trying to decipher your opinions . No one is prejudiced by my having more than four days to do that. You have changed your opinion by

clarifications, even though you have declined to call your March 19-20, 2014 order a "draft" (as I asked and you declined to say it was). I have pointed out errors I see in that opinion, with all due respect, and I DID TAKE AN IMMEDIATE APPEAL. YOU held onto this case preventing the appeal and YOU suggested you would actually let me litigate retaliation uynder FEDERAL law, in a clarification of your opinion issued separately months after it that March 19-20, 2014 opinion. That gave me some reason to reconsider a direct appeal.

Right now I do not know whether I should ask for that once again or not. I had been explicit, trying not to file out of time. I have tried to follow court rules to the letter with great care, though I am subject to the less demanding pro se standard for people without law degrees in this action. Your selective quotation may be necessary to an extent to keep your order concise, but you take things out of context and do not let me know what in fact you do have in mind if, for example, you have excluded an eyewitness to my having been roughed up by staff called by physicians to escort me out of the emergency room (where I never wanted to find myself that night), and which they knew from medical records they had accessed that night that I was documented in those records to be "threatening to sue" the hospital, and had complained of discrimination and retaliation in the past.

Atrributing the retaliation and atmosphere of impunity FOR retaliation (an accepted theory under the ADA) to the corporations would entail my showing wide knowledge of my complaints, and that staff thought they were acting in an environment of impunity (e.g., to take one well-known and documented example – for which I would introduce the correspondence to and from the hospital and phone records -- where a doctor did feel free to tell me "go ahead and kill yourself and don't call back!" before hanging up after I had called the emergency room to speak to a nurse there). Or, where a jury might conclude that staff are responsible for or the administration was on notice and discussed widely with staff and did investigations OF and with staff about my complaints and threats to sue, such that it might be appreciated and certainly not unwelcome to take actions that might discourage me from filing the lawsuit I threatened to file and with which they had not yet been served. (But they had asked when and where I was filing it – so they knew it had federal civil rights elements.) We do not have the possible testimony of persons who were never identified in 8 months of briefing Judge Freeman allowed defendants to take up, <u>but rather than blame any employee for bad acts, they in many documents and depositions sought to claim that what staff did was policy and procedure</u>. I did not want to sue an individual. I maintain the corporations are liable for what their employees were required and permitted to do and that the corporations were on knowledge. For that, I would call witnesses (or depositions) of all their (or many of their) Rule 30-b-6 witnesses.

You have not said how long a trial you have in mind other than first "two weeks" and then "two days." I only want a trial if it meaningfully permits

me to be heard on most of the federal issues that led up to even the 2004 retaliation, which entails disclosure of the REASON and MOTIVATION the Defendants had for retaliating (tolerating known misconduct, and depending on the level of staff, calling on lower level staff with requests for such things as my being physically restrained while I exited the building, after a visit I did not want to have the the E.R. and by which time I had been there many times and did not need any "escort" by staff about whom I had complained, ascertain as I was how much was permitted by the Defendant corporations – and it turns out, quite a bit. Including what I claim as retaliation.

FOUR DAYS notice is not fair in a 10+ year old case as notice when you have just declined a motion, requiring me to change gears and try to understand WHAT if anything you will allow me to present. The list of exhibitis, IF IT IS ALLOWED TO BE A LIST RATHER THAN THE REDACTED FILING OR SOME SUBSET I WOULD HAVE MADE (DULY NOTING THAT I WOULD ADDRESS ALL ISSUES IN MY MOTION PRACTICE even if and though as you found, Defendants did not address Nov. 2004 allegations in the pleadings).

If you do not simply regret having allowed a trial as some sort of crumb thrown to me about issues you have taken the year 2014 to take away from my case, then restore, then (and it is here that we seem to be) to be it seems without guidance as to whether you would yourself prefer to have had me take that appeal back in March 2014, as I tried to do. You are the reason I did not renew the explicit request to appeal: YOU clarified your orders of March 19-20, 2014 to state something quite new about them. The delay has not prejudiced my adversaries, it has prejudiced me. I stlll believe you should let me put on my whole case.

If not, I think you should let me put on my whole case up to and concerning the Nov. 2004 incident (one among many that already had occurred by that date though it would be followed by many more).

<u>With that CONTEXT from documents, and depositions, which I would display as posters (and handouts if you permit), the jury can/could assess the actual strength of my case for retaliation</u> (and also if you permit after first saying you would, then you would not, and now silent on "res ipsa" theories of liability), against the Defendants I contend are ultimately responsible through their policies, practices, what they knew, what they wished to discourage (a lawsuit as well as any further complaints to federal and state agencies), and whether there was a punitive aspect and not merely an effort to deter me from filing suit in state or federal court (and they did ask which court I would be filing in if I did file, meaning they did understand that this was a federal civil rights action NOT a garden variety tort action).

I hope this has NOT been another year lost. I spent most of this year litigating again the statutes of limitations claim and the protective order claims I SHOULD NOT HAVE TO BE FACING EITHER EVER OR REPEATEDLY.

As in most cases, this case should end only with the hearing of the merits which should involve hearing from BOTH SIDES and ON A PUBLIC RECORD FOR BOTH, NOT JUST ONE SIDE. I have been defamed if differently than Alan Dershowitz (whose recent efforts to have disbarred at least several lawyers and to intervene in a case naming him not as a party but naming him in salacious suggestions, and to proceed against those lawyers for DEFAMATION, comes up against the strong public policy that makes such cases hard to win even if one has been treated extraordinarily indecently and unfairly). It is largely up to individual judges to police this kind of conduct in the civil context, and up to prosecutors as you also know to largely determine outcomes in most criminal litigation (at least according to your colleague Judge Rakoff and myriad other judges, see, e.g,, exchanges in the recent NY Review of Books).

I meant no disrespect for the COURT in referring to a charade, but that is where the court is being led by the Defendants. At a certain point, then you as the presiding judge will own the case they encouraged you to take as they framed it (not as I framed it and therefore as I said in my notice of appeal on March 27, 2014, which was not intended as a permissive appeal, as I thought you were DONE with the federal aspects of this case and it is very unusual to maintain jurisdiction over pendent state law claims, and I had just returned from Washington, DC and was ill, but I read your order as one I should then appeal along with those of Jan. 29-30, 2014. And that is what I did. You then said you were holding on to the case. The Supreme Court did not take my petition for certiorari, thought they did retitle it for it was obvious to them surely that there is federal interlocutory jurisdiction. Justice Sotomayor took no part in that decision, though she is not the only Justice from New York.

I hope you will allow me more than four days. These changes and sudden moves are exhausting for me but perhaps you will help me recover if I can outlast you and Defendants, and feel good about spending all I have left of my money, suffering and time in this world on this effort to do my own small part not only to stand up for myself (I should not have to feel ashamed of having depression or a trauma disorder --- and in that regard perhaps those who took calls from me while staff threatened to "commit" me when no such plan was underway, and who insisted on listening to the calls while taunting me, can testify – Andrea Butler Friedenberger, Susan Stefan, and possibly others), but also for others who may feel indeed quite threatened by the process of litigating against these Defendant corporations, or who are not willing to give up privacy that I have had stripped from me anyway (not that this is acceptable particularly where I am denied the right to respond on equal terms!, not acceptable at all). The case is in my interest and the public interest. In other words. A good case is a sad thing to waste, and I certainly